

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q95033

Maki ITO, et al.

Appln. No.: 10/582,112

Group Art Unit: 3729

Confirmation No.: 1655

Examiner: NGUYEN, Tai V.

Filed: June 8, 2006

For: METHOD OF MANUFACTURING ACTUATOR DEVICE AND LIQUID-JET
APPARATUS

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Please review and enter the following remarks summarizing the in-person interview
conducted on February 9, 2009:

REMARKS

During the interview, the following was discussed:

1. Brief description of exhibits or demonstration: N/A
2. Identification of claims discussed: Claim 6
3. Identification of art discussed: Shimada et al. (US 6,378,996; hereafter
“Shimada”) and Joo et al. (US 6,268,258; hereafter “Joo”).
4. Identification of principal proposed amendments: None

5. Brief Identification of principal arguments: There is no teaching, suggestion and motivation to combine Shimada and Joo to achieve the method recited in claim 6. This is because the Joo reference only discloses a semiconductor-based capacitor including a “dielectric film” allegedly used as an insulation film between the upper and lower electrodes (FIG. 6G), while the claimed method is directed to an actuator device including an “insulation film” disposed below the upper and lower electrodes. Further, the dielectric film of Joo may only correspond to the piezoelectric layer of the claimed method in a structural aspect. That is, one skilled in the art would not have been taught, suggested or motivated to combine the two references at least because: (i) the Joo reference is directed to a completely different device compared to that of the Shimada reference and the claimed method; and (ii) the dielectric film of Joo is distinguished from the insulation film of the claimed method in structural/functional aspects.

6. Indication of other pertinent matters discussed: None

7. Results of Interview: The Examiners agreed with Applicant’s arguments that there is at least no motivation to combine two references in different fields of art.

It is respectfully submitted that the instant STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.2 and 1.133 and MPEP § 713.04.

It is believed that no petition or fee is required. However, if the USPTO deems otherwise, Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee, except for the Issue Fee, for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,

/Seunghee Park /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Seunghee Park
Registration No. 60,719

February 19, 2009